

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
11

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and the  
13 STATE OF CALIFORNIA *ex rel.*,  
14 SHELBY EIDSON,

15 *Plaintiffs,*

16 vs.

17 AURORA LAS ENCINAS LLC, LINDA  
18 PARKS, SIGNATURE HEALTHCARE  
19 SERVICES LLC, AND DOES 1  
20 THROUGH 10, jointly and severally,

21 *Defendants.*  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No.: CV 10-1031 JAK (RZx)

(Hon. John A. Kronstadt)

ORDER DENYING RELATOR'S EX  
PARTE APPLICATION "TO  
COMPEL ...COMPLIANCE AND  
FOR RECONSIDERATION...."  
(DKT. 388)

1 Relator's Ex Parte Application with respect to: (i) the contention that  
2 Defendants have failed to comply with orders concerning discovery; and (ii) to  
3 reconsider the Court's prior Order denying the request to extend the time for fact  
4 discovery, is DENIED. There is no showing of an emergency that warrants ex parte  
5 relief. Thus, to the extent that claims are made as to non-compliance with discovery  
6 obligations or orders, there is not a sufficient showing that such matters could not  
7 have been raised more promptly, particularly in this matter which has been pending  
8 since 2010. The Ex Parte Application also raised issues pursuant to Civil Rule 56(f).  
9 It is inefficient to consider such issues in the context of the Ex Parte Application.  
10 Rather, such issues will be considered in the context of the consideration of  
11 Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment. The request for reconsideration also  
12 fails. It is premised on the same claims as to non-compliance with discovery  
13 obligations. Further, it fails to meet the standards of Local Rule 7-18.  
14

15  
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17  
18  
19 Dated: May 7, 2013

20 By: 

21 HON. JOHN A. KRONSTADT  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28